

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

#### Rejection of claims 1-7, 11, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-7, 11, 13, and 14 presently stand rejected as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner asserts that, in claim 1, the wave parameter is output to an audio processor, at line 6, but is output by the audio processor at line 9. Claim 1 is revised by restating the “extracting” step as extracting a modulation parameter and a control parameter from the parameter look-up table by the audio processor based on the wave parameter. As amended, claim 1 avoids the apparent contradiction indicated by the Examiner. Support for this amendment is found in the original specification at least at line 15 of page 7 to line 7 of page 8.

The Examiner also asserts that, regarding claims 3 and 11, it is not clear how one parameter can “have” two other parameters, and what the relationship is. Claims 3 and 11 are amended to more clearly indicate that the wave parameter includes a timbre parameter and a scale parameter. Support for this amendment is found in the original specification at least at lines 23 and 24 of page 6, and lines 12-14 of page 7.

The Examiner further asserts that, in claims 4, 5, 13, and 14, it is not clearly set forth how one parameter is “relative” to the other parameter. Claims 4, 5, 13, and 14 are amended to indicate that one parameter corresponds to another, such as in claim 4 which is amended to indicate that timbre parameter is corresponding to the modulation parameter. Support for this amendment is found in the original specification at least at line 24 of page 6 to line 3 of page 7, and lines 12-14 of page 7.

In view of these amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are fully compliant with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Allowable subject matter

The Examiner has indicated that claims 8-10 and 12 are allowed, and that claims 1-7, 11, 13, and 14 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. As discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the presently amended claims are fully compliant with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7, 11, 13, and 14 are now allowable, such that all of claims 1-14 are allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that claims 1-14 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176  
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: June 4, 2009

Respectfully submitted,



JOHN R. SCHAEFFER  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 47,921